

REMARKS

This Amendment and Response is in reply to the Office Action dated February 5, 2008. A three (3) month extension of time is filed herewith. Therefore, the time period for response extends up to and includes August 5, 2008. A Request For Continued Examination (RCE) is filed herewith. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for his careful review and consideration of this application.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 15. Claims 1-20 remain pending in the present application.

Specification

First in the Office Action, the specification was objected to because of various informalities. Applicant has made the appropriate corrections in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Withdrawal of the objections is requested.

Claim Objections

Next in the subject Action, the Examiner objected to claims 4, 5, 10, 12, 13 and 15. Applicant has made the corrections suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections is requested. It is noted that the amendments discussed in this and the preceding section were not made to overcome an art based rejection and so should not be construed in a limiting manner.

§ 102(b) Rejections

Next in the subject Action, claims 1, 4, 6-8, 11-12, 15, 16-18, and 20 were rejected under §102(b) as being anticipated by Young et al. or Itou. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent claims 1, 4, 11, and 12 have been amended to recite that the second end is not physically connected to the second resonator (claim 1); the second end being physically unconnected from the coupling strip (claim 4); the second end is unconnected from the second resonator (claim 11); and wherein the second end is not physically connected to the coupling strip (claim 12). In sharp contrast, both Young et al. and Itou disclose a physical connection by a transmission line between the second resonator and the "second end" (as identified by the

Examiner). Therefore, neither Young et al. nor Itou anticipate Applicant's invention. Further, the physical connection disclosed in these two references teaches away from Applicant's invention since the distance and overlap cannot be easily varied in order to control the secondary coupling.

Claims 6-8 and 15 depend from claim 1 and claims 16-18 and 20 depend from claim 4, and so include the limitations of the respective independent claims. Accordingly, claims 6-8, 15, 16-18 and 20 are also in condition for allowance.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection. Applicant does not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary.

Claim 3 was rejected under §102(b) as being anticipated by Itou. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent claim 3 has been amended to recite that the second resonator not being physically connected to the second end. In sharp contrast, Itou discloses a physical connection by a transmission line between the second resonator and the "second end" (as identified by the Examiner). Therefore, Itou does not anticipate Applicant's invention. Further, the physical connection disclosed in Itou teaches away from Applicant's invention since the distance and overlap cannot be easily varied in order to control the secondary coupling.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection. Applicant does not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary.

Claims 9 and 19 were rejected under §102(b) as being anticipated by Young et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 9 and 19 depend from claims 1 and 4 respectively, and so include the limitations of the respective independent claims. Thus, for the reasons set forth above, claims 9 and 19 are also in condition for allowance.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection. Applicant does not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary.

**§ 103(a) Rejections**

Claims 2 and 10 were rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over either Young et al. or Itou in view of the Setsune et al. patent abstract. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 2 and 10 depend from claim 1, and so include the limitation of that claim. As discussed above, neither Young et al. nor Itou disclose the invention recited in Applicant's claim 1. Setsune et al. does not overcome the deficiencies of the two references. Thus, for the reasons set forth above, claims 2 and 10 are also in condition for allowance.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection. Applicant does not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication that claims 13 and 14 are allowed.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD

P. O. Box 2903

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903

(612) 336-4755

By

Brian H. Batzli

Reg. No. 32,960

Date: 5 August 2008